



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

has been a great accomplishment of past history. It will enter into the structure of the international organization that is yet to be. The same thing is true of these United States of America.

True, the British Empire of 1914 has passed from the stage. It is now increasingly and more accurately spoken of as the British Commonwealth. The six great divisions of the Empire are on a plane of equality little dreamed of at the beginning of the war. We are told that the British Government will welcome a Canadian colleague at Washington. Suggestions from the Dominions relative to matters of foreign relations are invited. It is recognized that these Dominions have now been accepted fully into the comity of nations. This was the fact in Paris. They signed the Treaty of Versailles; indeed, all the other treaties. To use Mr. George's words, "They have achieved full national status, and they now stand beside the United Kingdom as equal partners in the dignities and the responsibilities of the British Commonwealth."

But all the Dominions maintain their allegiance. Mr. Meighen pointed out that the Dominions are united by their history, by mutual trust, "and by a fundamental intention to preserve a common allegiance." We are familiar with the fact that General Smuts is a strong adherent to the principle of a united British Commonwealth. The representative from India indicated the ambition of that country to acquire full dominion status.

Thus, our general impression is that the Imperial Conference in London, itself an evidence of the value of conference, has ironed out many of the difficulties facing the British, added its bit to the better day, and given to the world a renewed faith in the possibilities of peaceable settlement. Its very method, as well as spirit, gives substance and solidity to Mr. Harding's words over the coffins of boys who had died in France, "It must not happen again."

TOLSTOYAN NON-RESISTANCE IN THE LABORATORY

THERE IS AN INTERESTING, frail, little man, vegetarian and faster, in India, called Mahatma Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. He is revered and followed, it is said, by a larger number than any human being has ever had in any country. Following an interview with Lord Reading, the present Viceroy of India, Mr. Gandhi has announced that so long as the men in India stand by the principle of non-violence and the spirit of sacrifice for the cause of justice to their country, no power on earth can check them from attaining their "swaraj," or independence, within the year. Of course, Mr. Gandhi has opponents, not only among the

English, but among the natives of India. Mr. Tagore, the well-known poet, has recently severely criticized him for his opposition to the teaching of any foreign language in the schools of India. There are extremists, such as Lala Lajput Rai, of Punjab, who has recently denounced anything looking toward a compromise between Gandhi and the Viceroy. Fanatics, especially from Afghan, are embarrassing Mr. Gandhi and the Non-Co-operative movement. But this most unusual combination of practical politician and visionary dreamer, bent upon establishing an India for India—politically, economically, educationally, and religiously—has presented Britain with not a few sleepless nights.

England has been working upon India for some two hundred fifty years, for it was in 1757 that Clive won his victory of Plassey. Today, as a result largely of Mr. Gandhi's propaganda, she is confronted with a threatening boycott of everything British in the way of manufactured goods; with the resignation of every native of India now in the government employ; with a new and insidious attack in terms of Tolstoyan non-resistance; with a man who preaches only to the souls of men that the militarism of the Western nations is blasphemy against God. This man has concerned himself with such practical matters as home industries. He has won the support of many Mohammedans in his crusade against everything British. He travels barefooted, third class, and teaches the principle of the oneness of humanity. He is opposed to all castes and to the use of titles, with the result that large numbers of young Hindus have returned their medals and titles. Crowds follow him and listen to him, kissing his garments as they may. The followers of Clive, Hastings, Bentinck, of the earlier period, and of Lytton, Ripon and Curzon, of the latter days, are face to face with large tasks in India.

THE TRIALS of war criminals in Leipsic seem to be satisfying nobody but the accused. Even in Germany public opinion commonly referred to as moderate is reported as regretful that the sentences have not been more severe. There is also a general agreement in Germany that the Junker and reactionary parties have been carrying on a violent propaganda throughout Germany in the interest of the defendants. The acquittal of the German officer, General Stenger, accused of instructing his men to take no prisoners, resulted in the immediate withdrawal of the French legal representatives at the Leipsic court. The French position is that their legal mission was both useless and ridiculous. It appears that France has repudiated the Leipsic trials. It would seem, therefore, that the whole question of the trying of

war criminals is reopened. This is unfortunate, if not dangerous. Under the terms of article 228 of the Treaty of Versailles, the German Government recognized the right of her enemies to try Germans accused of having committed acts in violation of the laws and customs of war, and that notwithstanding any proceedings of prosecutions before a tribunal in Germany. Under the terms of the treaty, the German Government also promised to hand over to her enemies all persons accused of having committed such acts. In January, 1920, however, the Allies consented that these accused persons should be tried in Germany, with the stipulation, however, that the Allies reserved the right of bringing the cases before their own tribunals if they were not satisfied. It seems, therefore, probable that France at least may insist upon her rights under the terms of the treaty. There is little doubt that leniency has subverted the ends of justice in the trials at Leipsic. Every one working for a rapprochement between France and Germany will regret this, for if the trials be held in France, whatever the outcome, it will be charged that the verdicts were too harsh. Our own feeling is that such cases should be submitted to an impartial court made up of judges chosen from the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague.

"MUST WE FIGHT JAPAN?", **"Must We Fight England?"**, **"The Rising Tide of Color"**—these are some of the titles quite praiseworthy from the point of view of the circulation manager, but altogether vicious from the point of view of persons interested in international sanity. We suppose titles must be chosen with the view of selling the book or magazine, but after we are satiated with these red lines in journalism, what will the make-up editor do next? We suppose we ought to get ready for **"Shall We Biff John Bull Between the Eyes?"**, **"Shall We Wipe France Off the Earth?"**, **"The Rising Dempsey of Religion"**—but our imagination fails.

INTER-ALLIED war debts are coming in for their share of discussion. The International Chamber of Commerce, meeting in London last month, has been talking about the European debts to the United States. In true American fashion the matter has been referred to a committee, and that's a good place for it. Mr. George E. Roberts, of the National City Bank, New York, is of the opinion that the whole matter should be held in abeyance until other and more pressing problems have been solved. The time may come when the United States will wish to discount the German debt, but that time is not yet.

THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE has suggested the wisdom of considering the possibilities in a League of Americas so often that we cannot refrain from expressing interest in the suggestion of Señor Garay, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama, that the outcome of the boundary dispute between his country and Costa Rica might lead ultimately to the formation of a Pan-American League of Nations. "The League of Nations" is not a very popular phrase in America, but something like unto an evolved Pan-American scientific and financial congress seems a natural step for the nations of this hemisphere. The idea for an American League of Nations has been suggested by Dr. Antonio S. de Bustamonte, delegate of the Cuban Republic to the Peace Congress of Versailles. It is pointed out that such an association of American nations would in no sense conflict with the Monroe Doctrine. It would do no violence to national sovereignties. One trouble with the suggestion in its present form is that it is unfortunately mixed up with the questions arising out of the White award in the boundary dispute between Costa Rica and Panama.

WE MUST RECORD the views of Senator Penrose in favor of disarmament by the United States regardless of conferences with other nations. Such an expression of views from one generally thought to be a reactionary representative of a munition State arrests attention. The Senator is quoted as expressing the belief that there cannot be another war in the near future in which this country would be involved. He added, "I don't think there is anything in the Japanese scare, so called." The Senator went on, "No one can by any stretch of imagination picture another war during the present generation and perhaps during the next, and no nation in the world desires to attack the United States or can do so successfully. . . . This is an era when it would be well for common sense to prevail. The world now only wants to go back to ways of peace and the profitable resumption of manufacture and commerce. It is going to tax the wealth of every nation to the limit for a good while to carry the present war legacies. How idle it is to talk of another war." A little more talk of that kind is what the world needs just now perhaps more than any other one thing.

THE POINT OF VIEW of European States is difficult for Americans to comprehend, particularly the German point of view. We have just read an article by Von Josef Viera entitled **"Why Germany Must Have Colonies"** (*Warum Must Deutschland Kolonien Haben?*). The writer goes on to complain that the

German children are cripples suffering with malnutrition, yet there are plenty of fats and raw materials everywhere. He inquires why, and answers that it is due to the lack of transportation and to German isolation. The only hope for Germany is economic independence, and economic independence is possible only in case Germany is in possession of colonies. The author doesn't believe that Kiautschau and the South Sea Islands are needed, but German Southwest Africa is necessary if Germany is to have cattle and farm products. Kameroun and Togoland are needed to furnish coffee, cocoa, tobacco, rubber, and vegetable fats. German East Africa is indispensable if Germany is to have grain, cotton, fruit, and coffee. Our own judgment is that the supreme interest facing Germany is not to get but to give, to convince the rest of the world of her sincerity and willingness to co-operate with other nations, for one of the great casualties of the war was the death of confidence in the spokesmen of Germany. That confidence needs to be revived.

IT IS of more than passing interest that General Horace Porter should have died May 29 and Louis Maria Drago eleven days later. In the first place, these were men far above the ordinary. General Porter became a brigadier at twenty-eight years of age. He was Grant's executive secretary during the General's first term as President. It was he who jotted down the words in which Grant stopped the cheering that broke out on the Union side at Appomattox: "The rebels are our countrymen again, and the best sign of rejoicing after the victory will be to abstain from all demonstrations in the field." For seven years, and that covering the period of the Spanish War, he was our ambassador to France. He shared with Joseph H. Choate the honors as delegate to the second Hague Conference in 1907. It was there that he came into contact with Dr. Drago, of Argentina. Louis Maria Drago was at the time of his death a member of the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague. He was for some time a member of the House of Representatives at Buenos Aires. He was Minister of Foreign Affairs under the presidency of President Roca, during which term of office he sent to the Argentine ambassador in Washington the instructions known as the Drago Doctrine. He was one of the arbitrators in the North Atlantic Coast Fisheries dispute. He was to have lectured at the International Relations Conference at Williams College this summer. The Drago Doctrine was a protest on principle against forceful collection of a debt from Venezuela by Great Britain, Germany, and Italy, and asserted that "public debts should never bring about armed intervention, much less the material oc-

cupation of the soil of American nations by European Powers." The Pan-American Congress of 1906 referred the question to The Hague Peace Congress of 1907, where Dr. Drago and General Porter argued various phases of the subject, with the result that there was evolved what is now known as the Porter-Drago Doctrine, which doctrine forbids the employment of force for the collection of debts until the claims have been approved by an arbitration court, the payment being refused or the debtor refusing to arbitrate. The peace movement of the world will always associate the names of these two men, who from out their different but distinguished fields met and left the world wiser and better because of their meeting.

PEACE BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

By MANTON M. WYVELL, of Washington, D. C.
Formerly Counsel for the United States before the
International Joint Commission

IN ADDITION to the deplorable loss of life, the World War cost the United States from April 6, 1917, to July 1, 1921, in round numbers, forty billions of dollars (\$40,000,000,000), not counting sums loaned to foreign countries. The combined appropriations of the War and Navy Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, voted by the last Congress were \$939,271,377. To wage war, there is always ample machinery. A highly organized War Department, a very efficient Navy, are always ready, and other branches of the government are usually well prepared to co-ordinate to the very fullest extent. But to prevent war there is comparatively little machinery. How to make the best use of the machinery we have and to enlarge the machinery for peace is the highest duty of statesmanship.

It is true we have had our Hague tribunals, but they resulted in little definite permanent machinery. The Bryan peace treaties provide for the creation of a commission of five, which functions if a dispute should arise between the two signatory powers of the convention.

There is, however, one permanent peace organization, made up of three Americans and three Canadians, which regularly functions and which is always available to deal with disputes which may arise between Canada and the United States. I refer to the International Joint Commission, created by the Treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain.

Organized for the primary purpose of dealing with the problems arising over the use of the joint waterways, Article X of the treaty authorizes the two countries to submit to it for decision any questions or matters of difference arising between the two countries or either in relation to each other or in which their respective inhabitants are concerned.

Important as this commission is, and I may say that so far it has settled very satisfactorily every difference between the United States and Canada which has been submitted to it, it has never cost the United States Gov-